

ICOMOS ISC 20 WORKSHOP

WORLD HERITAGE AND THE PLACES OF THE 20TH CENTURY

2-5pm 7th July 2009 Utzon Room, Sydney Opera House

MINUTES

Chair: Susan Macdonald

1. Present

See List of Participants at **Appendix A**

2. Meeting aims and objectives (Susan Macdonald)

This meeting is the ISC20s 2nd World Heritage Workshop. It follows the workshop held by ISC20C at the ICOMOS General Assembly in Quebec in September 2008, where a framework for progressing the issues of comparative analysis and thematic context was agreed. This meeting aimed to:

- Recap on the issues the key organizations present (ICOMOS, Docomomo, UIA, TICIH) are dealing with in supporting the conservation of twentieth-century heritage places.
- Discuss recent activities and advice to the World Heritage Committee on 20th century heritage.

3. Updates from organisations involved in 20th world heritage.

The Presidents of ICOMOS International, Docomomo, UIA & a representative from TICCIH spoke on key issues and initiatives in relation to world heritage matters and 20th century heritage.

3.1 ICOMOS - Gustavo Araoz

- Broad consensus from ISC committees is needed about the issue of identifying significance for 20th C places. Need to work with other disciplines to have a consensus view eg ISCARSAH.
- The recent Corbusier nomination raised a number of issues surrounding the period. For serial nominations is it about the evolution of a designers work, its international impact,, which ones are chosen, what about places that have been altered(how much alteration is too much?)? Is it about the architect or the resultant places?
- This issue is likely to arise again as other serial nominations are underway – such as Frank Lloyd Wright (is it his genius or his contribution in the historic evolution of architecture, - this raises implications for whether the sites selected represent the best or the historical evolution of his work).
- Example of Opera House where the OUV was only identified for one criterion and specifically incorporates the need for functional change in the citation.

Docomomo - Maristella Casciato

- Docomomo pleased to continue relationship with ISC20C, furthering the Istanbul protocol worldwide
- The issue of civic significance and social impact prevalent in the intent of modern architects' work & this needs to be captured in nominations
- The significance must be about the work rather than the architect, Docomomo's view on this is clear- also see 1997 Docomomo World Heritage study.
- Docomomo's work with world heritage has attempted to include the full scope of significance

- A case study approach may be helpful for providing clarity about issues, Docomomo could assist here
- Guidance that identifies usual significance indicators e.g. Social, architectural, use and shows how these can be articulated for C20th places

UIA - Louise Cox

- Noted that UIA and ICOMOS have signed co-operative agreement.
- Register of 20C web site, started in 2000 - Docomomo came in together on the register with UIA and it is supported by the French Ministry for Culture. Any potential for additional cooperation eg by ISC20C would need permissions from this body.

TICCIH – Helen Lardner

- TICCIH's strategy for world heritage listing was outlined, comparative framework for industrial heritage places.
- 1996 agreement with ICOMOS an area of mutual interest and how to proceed.
- Currently examining how it can be implemented to raise the focus for industrial heritage and use for making assessments against world heritage criteria.
- Strategy is to illustrate how places can be assessed (different types) for OUV.
- Work was undertaken to address the gap on the WHL in relation to industrial heritage sites via 5 thematic studies, although some are dated: canals, railways, bridges, workers settlements, and most recently coal mines. The studies included information on how criteria can be met for these site typologies.
- A copy of the strategy/ paper under development can be provided by Helen for circulation and may be a useful basis for ISC 20C discussion.

ISC20C – Sheridan Burke

- Recapped 2007 meeting discussion following a series of requests for advice from the ICOMOS WH secretariat.
- Sharing Twentieth century discussion is vital to get messages across other ICSs - as most of the questions/ solutions are similar- eg typology.
- Knowledge management an issue within ICOMOS as a large voluntary organisation - questions come up, get answered but are then lost in the rotating corporate memory, so we want to find a way of storing this information so it is not reinvented(though very supportive of regular review). One solution would be a central repository (ISC20Cwebsite?) so that information can be accessed in a meaningful way and be accessible to all committees, with comment invited.
- The two advisory papers the ISC20 is currently working on can be thus reviewed and added to over time.

3. Development of draft guidelines for preparing a thematic framework for nominations to the World Heritage List for 20th places. Introduction to the paper, comments and discussion.

A draft paper was pre-circulated to participants, proposing a study to develop a thematic framework study to assist the World Heritage Committee to contextually position nominated properties in the context of the 20th century and assist in developing guidance for State Parties preparing nominations (Appendix B). Such a study can also provide a basis for State Parties to develop strategic programs for protection and conservation of their 20th century heritage nationally and locally.

SM compared the number of houses/housing sites from the 20thC on the WHL to housing from other periods as an example of the need for addressing this area, and swiftly.

The meeting discussion addressed the best way to approach developing a thematic framework and the following points emerged:

- Development of lists based on principle themes (i.e. that have specific outcomes). Many countries have thematic or historic frameworks examples include:
 - English Heritage post-war listing program which looked at typologies such as healthcare, religion, and education.
 - Australian national historic themes was cited as an example,
 - Canada also has national themes for understanding the 20C, e.g., themes of emancipation, war, communication, cultural phenomena, etc (DB).
 - National Parks Service in USA/National Register- national themes for buildings, e.g. GSA, war themes, civil rights.
- Docomomo Spain – works within themes for 20th C, e.g. Industrial sites, (all commissioned by ministry or architecture board)
- Docomomo Portugal – study of 20th C buildings across Portugal. Historic, thematic, chronological, typological.
- 20C heritage- thematic concepts that will influence approach include: planning, architecture, landscape, social engineering (South Africa an example), transfer of technology globally (communication, aircraft).
- Global themes need to look at history and typology
- Start by articulating criteria to establish themes after reviewing existing sources such as those listed above.

Actions for the developing the Twentieth Century heritage thematic framework:

- It was agreed to form a sub-committee(chaired by SM). to include ISC20 members, ICOMOS (DB, SM) Docomomo (MC), TICCIH (HL) and a UIA rep to
 1. develop the thematic framework for Twentieth century heritage places to be agreed by the ISC20C (and hopefully our member organisations),
 2. draft a brief on how to proceed to establish the global themes and
 3. seek funding for an independent consultants work as agreed at the previous workshop in October 2007. (SM)
- SB will discuss how such a process might be funded with ICOMOS Secretary General
- HL will obtain TICCIH paper and the coal mines study to circulate
- GH can provide assistance on USA models

4. Draft guidelines for Comparative Analysis for WH nominations

A draft paper on approaches to comparative analysis was pre-circulated for to facilitate this discussion, (Appendix C).

- Thematic Framework will assist greatly the comparative analysis work. In the absence of the overall thematic framework, nominations are being considered in isolation, with a wide range of thematic contexts described in recent nominations. However, meanwhile, an ISC20C discussion paper has been developed and guidance to the WHC on comparative analysis.
- Typical criteria used for assessing 20C places include i, ii, iv, and v.
- Although ISC20C has provided advice re the comparative analysis questions around “is it the place or the whole body of work?”, there is still confusion on this, hence the need for the a written discussion or position paper A number of forthcoming WH nominations will seek to document the whole or select elements of the body of work of modernist architects – e.g. Corbusier, FLW.
- The draft paper prepared by ISC20C on Comparative Analysis for twentieth century places was circulated prior to the meeting and no comments were received. No further discussion was raised on the paper. The paper can now be passed to the ICOMOS World Heritage Working group (Chair Kristal Buckley) and Regina Durighello for comment and use. It could be repackaged in a similar format to others following their comment.

Actions for the developing the Twentieth Century heritage comparative analysis:

Paper to be provided to the ICOMOS WHWG & Regina Durighello for comment - SB

5. Conclusions

At our 2010 meeting (in Spain?) we hope to have

1. A draft brief for the thematic framework study(SM)
2. Funding sourced (SB)
3. The comparative analysis paper on ISC20C website (KN)

ICOMOS ISC 20 WORKSHOP
WORLD HERITAGE AND THE PLACES OF THE 20TH CENTURY
2-5pm 7th July 2009 Utzon Room, Sydney Opera House

Appendix A: List of Participants

Laura Robinson, Andre van Graan, Fernando De Los Monteros Espinosa, Dinu Bumbaru, Gustavo Araoz, Maristella Casciato, Kyle Normandin, Gunny Harboe, Helen Lardner, Pamela Jerome, Britt Wisth, Susan McIntyre-Tamwoy, Duncan Marshall, Marilyn Truscott, Lousie Cox, David Look, Susan Macdonald, Rachel Jackson, Sheridan Burke.

Appendix B

ICOMOS INTERNATIONAL ISC 20

PROPOSAL FOR A THEMATIC STUDY OF THE 20TH CENTURY TO ASSIST IN THE ASSESMENT OF NOMINATIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST FOR 20TH CENTURY HERITAGE PLACES

A comprehensive thematic analysis to provide the contextual framework for the assessment of twentieth-century heritage places

In 1994 Docomomo prepared a report for ICOMOSⁱ, inviting Docomomo working parties to nominate a world-wide selection of modern buildings and sites with outstanding universal value (OUV) which might be proposed to the World Heritage List. A list of approximately 100 items was prepared. It recognized certain building genres; the oeuvres of certain architects/designers (Alvar Alto, Ludwig Mies Van der Rohe, Le Corbusier and Frank Lloyd Wright) and the legacy of planned cities warranted particular research emphasis.

Subsequently each national Docomomo working group was invited to nominate their nation's 10 most important Modernist sites, generally buildings. 800 selected entries from the fiche that makes up the Docomomo International Register were published in book form in 2000ⁱⁱ.

In 2002-4, ICOMOS initiated a surveyⁱⁱⁱ of management approaches to twentieth-century places more generally, and invited nominations from national committees of their 20 most significant places. Forty two national committees responded with 600 nominations including vernacular buildings, industrial complexes, landscapes and urban areas. This global survey is as yet unpublished.

The UIA has prepared an Index of 20th century architectural heritage, a searchable on-line data base of significant architectural works.

Each of these surveys is limited by the scope of its respondents and their specific areas of interest. Docomomo's remit is specific and dedicated to the architecture of the Modern Movement, although includes landscape architecture and urban planning. The UIA's data base is architectural reflecting the organizations professional interest. ICOMOS has a broader interest base, but the survey was limited by the perspectives of the voluntary participants. Regional conceptual frameworks such as mAANs, rigorous tentative lists such as Canada's provide other models for reference.

In 2001 UNESCO's World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and Docomomo launched a joint program for the identification, documentation and promotion of modern heritage convening a series of regional expert meetings and publishing an initial discussion paper in 2003^{iv} The meetings concluded with a series of recommendations including co-ordinated identification and the development of tentative lists and frameworks.

As yet there is no comprehensive or broad thematic study of the twentieth century that moves beyond the framework of modern architecture. Such a study would assist in:

- identifying strategically the places that best represent the era
- assist in assessing the comparative significance of places put forward for nomination to the World Heritage List
- assist State parties in developing priorities for tentative lists.

The proposed study is best prepared as an independent work, unfettered by the specific interest of the various groups but informed by their knowledge of the subject matter.

Moving forward

At the ISC20 Workshop on World Heritage held in Quebec on Monday 29th September, 2009 the meeting resolved to *“Prepare a brief for developing a thematic framework which covers all forms of heritage. Collaboration with Docomomo, TICCIH and UIA will be sought. This will include guidance for comparative analysis, evaluating authenticity and integrity”*.

The ISC20C subsequently submitted a resolution to the ICOMOS General Assembly seeking financial priority for this work, which was endorsed. ISC20C wishes to initiate work on this study in close collaboration with Docomomo, TICCIH and the UIA.

The following next steps have been agreed by ISC20C:

1. Establish a sub-committee representative of the four organizations to develop and manage the work (Susan Macdonald ICOMOS ISC20, Dinu Bumbaru ICOMOS ISC20, Maristella Casciato President docomomo International, Helen Lardner TICCIH)
2. Develop & draft an outline thematic framework for the 20th century for agreement with the 4 representative organizations drawing on past studies and themes.
3. Identify potential funding partners or sponsors for the study.
4. Develop a brief for the study.
5. Tender a contract for its preparation or components of the study.
6. Commission the study
7. Supervise and review the project via sub-committee
8. Consult with wider membership of represented organizations
9. Final edit and review via the sub committee
10. Present study to represented organizations and the WHC

Funding should be explored through each of the represented organizations and with the advice of the World Heritage Centre. Funding may be possible through various Foundations and organizations known to support heritage initiatives such as the World Monuments Fund.

Draft 1: SM/SB 26 May 2009

Draft 2: SM 27 September 2009

ⁱ Docomomo. **The Modern Movement and the World Heritage List** 1997

ⁱⁱ **The Modern Movement in Architecture: Selections from the Docomomo Registers** 2000, Dennis Sharp & Catherine Cooke editors, 280 p.

ⁱⁱⁱ **ICOMOS Montreal Action Plan** 2003

^{iv} World Heritage Series n°5 - Identification and Documentation of Modern Heritage 2003

ICOMOS INTERNATIONAL ISC 20

DRAFT GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS FOR NOMINATIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST FOR 20TH PLACES

Introduction

A requirement of the World Heritage Nomination process is the inclusion of a comparative analysis of a nominated site, to test its significance at a world scale. Section III.B 132 3. of the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention* outlines the requirements for comparative analysis.

The following guidance provides additional information for completing a comparative analysis for 20C heritage places.

Preparing a comparative analysis for 20th C heritage places

Comparative analysis is influenced by;

1. the criteria under which the place (site) is nominated, and
2. whether it is an individual or a serial site (*) place based nomination.

* *Serial sites may be thematically related or related because they share the same creator; the approach to the comparative analysis will change accordingly.*

It is noted that to date, the majority of nominations from the late 19th and 20th centuries have been nominated under the *Operational guideline's* criterion i, ii & iv, often with either i & iv or ii & iv in combination. The predominance of sites listed under criterion iv suggests that international significance should be described in the context of the history of modernism or the relevant internationally significant event or idea it represents.

Individual place/ site based nominations

Nominations under criterion i.

Sites nominated under *criterion i*) “represent a masterpiece of human creative genius” should compare the nominated place in two ways:

1. compare to other great sites through time that share a common typology, (for example, spiritual places of worship, places of entertainment, places of education etc.) and,
2. compare to other sites of creative genius from its own era.

Nominations under criterion ii

Sites nominated under *criterion ii*) “interchange of human values..” should compare the place against others that also lay claim to demonstrating key developments in the typology or historical context. For example, a site nominated as demonstrating exchange/transmission of ideas about modern architecture and planning such as Brasilia should compare it to other places of the epoch that achieved the same, but also

compare it to other places that have changed architecture and planning from other eras, in two steps as described above.

Sites nominated under criterion iv

Sites nominated against *criterion iv*) “ *association with events or ..ideas.. of outstanding universal value* should compare the site to others in its typology and demonstrate why this period of history is important in comparison to others.

Sites nominated under criterion v

Sites nominated against *criterion v*” should compare against other significant events or works that demonstrate this criterion.

Serial nominations

The Operational Guidelines provide for serial nominations (including those for 20th places) to the WHL may involve places from the same historical – cultural group (such as an, event cultural movement), the same type of property which is characteristic of the geographic zone (representing a specific typology or theme e.g. educational institutions). However, a recent trend encompasses a shift in grouping of places from typology or historical themes to include bodies of work of a specific creator, presumably nominating the body of works primarily under criterion (i): represent a masterpiece of human creative genius, or ii) interchange of human values.

The following comparisons are suggested:

Bodies of work by an architect, engineers, artist

- Compare to other bodies of work which could claim the same legacy or influence. The comparison should highlight the international relevance of the work to distinguish it from regional or national significance. How has the artists work influenced trends worldwide both transcending time and within its epoch?

Thematically/ historically related serial nominations e.g. mining sites

- compare the nominated sites to other specifically functional groups of activities that represent a specifically 20th C phenomena.
- Compare to other places or series of places represented under that thematic area of study across time e.g. other mining sites.

The 20th C is characterized by the rise/emergence of professionalisms for architects and other related professionals such as engineers. There is now increasing scholarship about individual and their impact on global architectural/engineering trends that are useful for comparative analysis work.

SM/26 May 2009